

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

April 20, 2012

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 11-20643

Summary Calendar

FELICIA NICOLE JONES,

Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

CITIMORTGAGE, INC.; PIONEER HOMES; PATRICK R. DONAHOE,
Postmaster General United States Postal Service,

Defendants-Appellees

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Texas
USDC No. 4:11-MC-376

Before KING, JOLLY, and GRAVES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Felicia Nicole Jones has filed a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP) in this appeal of the district court's dismissal with prejudice of her pro se complaint. Jones also has filed a motion requesting a telephone hearing. The district court dismissed her complaint on the ground that she did not describe a claim recognized at law. We construe the district court's dismissal

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 11-20643

as a dismissal as frivolous and for failure to state a claim. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii).

Jones has failed to address the district court's rationale for dismissing her claims against Citimortgage, Inc., or her claims against Pioneer Homes. Although we liberally construe pro se filings, *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972), even pro se litigants must raise arguments in order to preserve them, *Yohey v. Collins*, 985 F.2d 222, 224-25 (5th Cir. 1993). By failing to discuss the district court's rationale for dismissing these claims, Jones has abandoned them. *See Brinkmann v. Dallas County Deputy Sheriff Abner*, 813 F.2d 744, 748 (5th Cir. 1987). Although Jones provides some discussion in her brief regarding her claim against the United States Postal Service, Jones has inadequately briefed this issue as well. *See Yohey*, 985 F.2d at 224-25; *Brinkmann*, 813 F.2d at 748.

Because Jones has failed to demonstrate that she will raise a nonfrivolous issue on appeal, her motion for leave to proceed IFP is denied. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 24(a); *Carson v. Polley*, 689 F.2d 562, 586 (5th Cir. 1982). Her motion requesting a telephone hearing also is denied. The appeal is without arguable merit, *see Howard v. King*, 707 F.2d 215, 220 (5th Cir. 1983), and it is dismissed as frivolous. *See* 5TH CIR. R. 42.2.

MOTIONS DENIED; APPEAL DISMISSED.